

- 4 -

anyone other than the members of my family who owned 202 College Avenue, Frederick, Maryland exert any possession or control whatsoever over the said disputed parcel of ground." Other than stating that the property was used to park cars, Mr. Thomas does not describe what his family's possession of the disputed property consisted of. Mr. Lebherz in his Affidavit only adds that "(t)he Thomas family also during such period exercised all required maintenance of this property, including snow removal in the winter time." Ordinarily it is for the jury to decide whether the possession of the adverse claimant was exclusive in view of all the circumstances. Bishop v. Stackus, 206 Md. 493 (1955) (Held that plaintiffs' actual possession of defendant's adjoining land and plaintiffs' construction of garage, driveway and planting of trees, shrubs and garden constituted exclusive possession.) It is for the jury to determine in this case whether the parking of cars and the performance of all required maintenance is sufficient to constitute exclusive possession.

(e) Whether Plaintiff's admitted non-payment of taxes and failure to inclose the disputed property precludes her from obtaining title by adverse possession. According to Mr. Lebherz's Affidavit, he has paid the city and county property taxes on the disputed property since sometime in the 1950's. He also states in his Affidavit that a hedge was planted in a relatively straight line across the entire back of the property between 1929 and 1931 and has remained in that location continuously since such planting. The payment of taxes by an adverse claimant is not sufficient in itself to prove adverse